

Presentation of monoids generated by a projection and an involution

Pascal Caron

Jean-Gabriel Luque

Bruno Patrou

February 2, 2024

Abstract

Monoids generated by elements of order two appear in numerous places in the literature. For example, Coxeter reflection groups in geometry, Kuratowski monoids in topology, various monoids generated by regular operations in language theory and so on. In order to initiate a classification of these monoids, we are interested in the subproblem of monoids, called strict 2-PIMs, generated by an involution and an idempotent. In this case we show, when the monoid is finite, that it is generated by a single equation (in addition to the two defining the involution and the idempotent). We then describe the exact possible forms of this equation and classify them. We recover Kuratowski's theorem as a special case of our study.

1 Introduction

Kuratowski's theorem [9] is a topology result which states that in a topological space, the monoid generated by a closure operation and the complement has at most 14 elements. Moreover, there exists a topological space and a set for which this bound of 14 is reached. For more on Kuratowski-type theorems for topological spaces, see Gardner and Jackson [7]. Hammer [8] noticed that such a statement is valid in a more general setting; it is not necessary to consider topological spaces and topological closure. The theorem is also valid if, instead of topological closure, we use a closure operator on a set X . Since Kleene's star is a closure operation on formal languages, Peleg [10] was the first to extend Kuratowski's result to operations in this context.

An orbit is a set of values corresponding to the different numbers of sets that can be obtained from operations. Dassow refines Kuratowski's work by taking (formal) languages as a set and involution and closure as operations [4, 5], then extends his work to Boolean functions [6]. In the same framework and also for languages, Charlier *et al.* [1] show that for a large number of operations, they also obtain finite orbits. D. Sherman [11] generalizes Kuratowski's theorem by considering, in addition to closures and complement, interior union and intersection operations.

Idempotency is a mathematical property of a function which states that the successive application of this function to its parameter is equal to the application once. This property arises both in the theory of projectors and in that of closure operations.

An involution, involutory function, or self-inverse function is a function that is its own inverse. This notion applies equally to projective geometry, where the square is the identity transformation, and to algebra, where an involution of an algebraic variety is an automorphism of the variety of order two.

An operation that generates a two-element monoid is either an involution or an idempotent operation. While the groups generated by only involutions have been extensively studied (see *e.g.* Coxeter [2, 3]), adding idempotent operations in the generator sets gives rise to more complicated structures that have not been classified yet.

In the same vein, we propose to include Kuratowski's theorem in a more general study: monoids generated by exactly one involution, not necessarily the complement, and one idempotent operation, not necessarily a closure one.

2 Preliminaries

A monoid is a set closed under an associative binary product having a neutral element denoted by Id. The juxtaposition of two elements represents their product, the operation symbol being omitted. A presentation of a monoid is a couple $\langle \mathcal{G} \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$ where \mathcal{G} is a set of generators and \mathcal{R} a set of equations inducing an equivalence relation between elements of the monoid. The sets \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{R} should be infinite but for this paper we restrict ourselves to finite sets and if $\mathcal{R} = \emptyset$ we recover the free monoid \mathcal{G}^* . The presented monoid $M = \langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{R} \rangle$ is isomorphic to the quotient of \mathcal{G}^* by the congruence induced by the equations \mathcal{R} , i.e. $M = \mathcal{G}^* / \equiv_{\mathcal{R}}$. For example, the presentation $\langle a, b \mid ab = ba \rangle$ designates the commutative monoid over the alphabet $\{a, b\}$ where each element is equivalent to one of the form $a^p b^q$ ($p, q \in \mathbb{N}$). To lighten the notations, the braces of \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{R} are omitted. A word w is an element of \mathcal{G}^* . For any $a \in \mathcal{G}$, we denote by $|w|_a$ the number of a in w . The order of a monoid is its number of elements.

A monoid generated by only one element, \square , is said monogenic. All infinite monogenic monoids are isomorphic to the semigroup of natural integers equipped with the addition. The presentation of such a monoid is reduced to $\langle \square \mid \rangle$ and its elements are $\text{Id}, \square, \square^2, \square^3, \dots$. For any integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists, up to an isomorphism, exactly n monogenic monoids of order n . Their presentations are of the form $\langle \square \mid \square^n = \square^k \rangle$, with $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ and their extensive description is $\{\text{Id}, \square, \square^2, \dots, \square^{n-1}\}$. The order of an element \square is the order of the monoid generated by \square .

The structure of monoids generated by two elements (digenic monoids) is much more complicated. In this paper, we focus on digenic monoids generated by a set of elements of order two. Such generators are either projections (idempotent operators \square such that $\square^2 = \square$) or involutions (operators \diamond such that $\diamond^2 = \text{Id}$). We, then, call PIM (for Projection-Involution-Monoid) any monoid generated by only generators of order 2 and 2-PIM any monoid generated by exactly two generators of order 2.

If both generators, \square and \diamond , are involutive then their roles are symmetrical and two situations can occur.

1. There exists a smallest integer p such that $(\square\diamond)^p = \text{Id}$. In fact, if it is not the case, we may have $(\square\diamond)^p \square = \text{Id}$ then by multiplying both sides by \diamond , we have $\diamond(\square\diamond)^p \square \diamond = \text{Id}$. Then multiplying these two equalities, we have $(\square\diamond)^{2p+2} = \text{Id}$. We have also $(\square\diamond)^p \square = \text{Id}$ implies $(\square\diamond)^p = \square$ and thus $(\square\diamond)^{2p} = \text{Id}$. Then from the previous equations, we have $(\square\diamond)^2 = \text{Id}$. Thus if p is even then $\square = \text{Id}$ and if p is odd then $\diamond = \text{Id}$ and so this case is degenerated.

In the non-degenerated case, the monoid

$$\langle \square, \diamond \mid \square^2 = \varepsilon, \diamond^2 = \varepsilon, (\square\diamond)^p = \varepsilon \rangle,$$

is the COXETER group $I_2(p)$ (see [2]) which contains exactly $2p$ elements.

2. For all integer p we have $(\square\Diamond)^p \neq \text{Id}$.

Then the generated monoid is infinite and its presentation is:

$$\langle \square, \Diamond \mid \square^2 = \varepsilon, \Diamond^2 = \varepsilon \rangle.$$

When the generators of a 2-PIM are exactly one projection and one involution, we call the monoid a strict 2-PIM. This is the structure we study in this paper.

3 The presentation of a strict 2-PIM

3.1 Generic cases

If the presentation of the monoid is restricted only by both constraints imposed to a monoid to be a strict 2-PIM, we obtain the following infinite monoid:

$$\langle \square, \Diamond \mid \square^2 = \square, \Diamond^2 = \varepsilon \rangle = \{ \square^d (\Diamond \square)^k \Diamond^f \mid d, f \in \{0, 1\}, k \in \mathbb{N} \}$$

Otherwise, the various equations that can be added to the presentation are listed in Table 1. All are obtained from the generic form

$$\square^{d_0} (\Diamond \square)^{k_0} \Diamond^{f_0} = \square^{d_1} (\Diamond \square)^{k_1} \Diamond^{f_1}$$

by varying the values of d_0, f_0, d_1 and f_1 and eliminating obvious symmetries.

d_0	f_0	d_1	f_1	form of equation	additional details	set
0	0	0	0	$(\Diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\Diamond \square)^{k_1}$	$k_0 \neq 0$ $k_0 < k_1$	$\mathbb{E}_{\text{Q}0}$
0	0	0	1	$(\Diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\Diamond \square)^{k_1} \Diamond$	$k_0 \neq 0$ $k_1 \neq 0$	$\mathbb{E}_{\text{Q}1}$
0	0	1	0	$(\Diamond \square)^{k_0} = \square (\Diamond \square)^{k_1}$	$k_0 \neq 0$	$\mathbb{E}_{\text{Q}2}$
0	0	1	1	$(\Diamond \square)^{k_0} = \square (\Diamond \square)^{k_1} \Diamond$	$k_0 \neq 0$	$\mathbb{E}_{\text{Q}3}$
0	1	0	1	$(\Diamond \square)^{k_0} \Diamond = (\Diamond \square)^{k_1} \Diamond$	$k_0 \neq 0$ $k_0 < k_1$	$\mathbb{E}_{\text{Q}4}$
0	1	1	0	$(\Diamond \square)^{k_0} \Diamond = \square (\Diamond \square)^{k_1}$	$k_0 \neq 0$	$\mathbb{E}_{\text{Q}5}$
0	1	1	1	$(\Diamond \square)^{k_0} \Diamond = \square (\Diamond \square)^{k_1} \Diamond$	$k_0 \neq 0$	$\mathbb{E}_{\text{Q}6}$
1	0	1	0	$\square (\Diamond \square)^{k_0} = \square (\Diamond \square)^{k_1}$	$k_0 < k_1$	$\mathbb{E}_{\text{Q}7}$
1	0	1	1	$\square (\Diamond \square)^{k_0} = \square (\Diamond \square)^{k_1} \Diamond$		$\mathbb{E}_{\text{Q}8}$
1	1	1	1	$\square (\Diamond \square)^{k_0} \Diamond = \square (\Diamond \square)^{k_1} \Diamond$	$k_0 < k_1$	$\mathbb{E}_{\text{Q}9}$

Table 1: Useful equations in strict 2-PIM presentations

The last column of the Table 1 gives a name to the set of equations described by the row by varying k_0 and k_1 , and the set of all these equations is denoted by $\mathbb{E}_{\text{Q}} = \bigcup_{i=0}^9 \mathbb{E}_{\text{Q}i}$

3.2 Degenerated cases

The details given in the third column avoid considering degenerate cases where monoids are in fact monogenic, as shown by Lemma 2.

Lemma 1. For every $k > 0$,

$$\text{if } (\diamond\Box)^k = \text{Id} \quad (i) \quad \text{or} \quad (\diamond\Box)^k \diamond = \text{Id} \quad (ii)$$

then $\Box = \text{Id}$.

Proof.

$$\begin{array}{ll} (\diamond\Box)^k = \text{Id} \quad (i) & (\diamond\Box)^k \diamond = \text{Id} \quad (ii) \\ \Rightarrow (\diamond\Box)^k = \Box & \Rightarrow (\diamond\Box)^k = \diamond \\ \Rightarrow \Box = \text{Id} & \Rightarrow (\diamond\Box)^k = \diamond\Box \\ & \Rightarrow \diamond\Box = \diamond \\ & \Rightarrow \Box = \text{Id} \end{array}$$

□

Lemma 2. A strict 2-PIM is monogenic if one of the following equations appears in its presentation:

1. $\text{Id} = (\diamond\Box)^k$ for $k > 0$;
2. $(\diamond\Box)^k = \diamond$ or $(\diamond\Box)^k \diamond = \text{Id}$ for $k \geq 0$;
3. $\text{Id} = \Box(\diamond\Box)^k$ for $k \geq 0$;
4. $\text{Id} = \Box(\diamond\Box)^k \diamond$ with $k \geq 0$;
5. $\diamond = (\diamond\Box)^k \diamond$ with $k > 0$;
6. $\diamond = \Box(\diamond\Box)^k$ with $k \geq 0$;
7. $\diamond = \Box(\diamond\Box)^k \diamond$ with $k \geq 0$.

Proof.

1. Lemma 1 (i) leads to an immediate conclusion.
2. If $k > 0$ then both equalities are equivalent to Lemma 1 (ii). If $k = 0$ then the statement reads $\diamond = \text{Id}$.
3. We have $\Box = \Box\text{Id} = \Box\Box(\diamond\Box)^k = \Box(\diamond\Box)^k = \text{Id}$.
4. We have $\text{Id} = \diamond\diamond = \diamond\Box(\diamond\Box)^k \diamond\diamond = (\diamond\Box)^{k+1}$. Hence, the result is recovered from Item 1.
5. From $\diamond = (\diamond\Box)^k \diamond$, we have $\text{Id} = (\diamond\Box)^k$ and we conclude using Item 1.
6. From $\diamond = \Box(\diamond\Box)^k$, we have $\text{Id} = (\diamond\Box)^{k+1}$ and we conclude using Item 1.
7. From $\diamond = \Box(\diamond\Box)^k \diamond$, we have $\text{Id} = (\diamond\Box)^{k+1} \diamond$ and we conclude using Item 2.

□

The cases enumerated in Lemma 2 correspond to degenerated cases of Table 1 for $k_0 = 0$. We summarize this in Table 2 below. We notice that setting $k_0 = 0$ or $k_1 = 0$ in equations of \mathbb{E}_{q7} , \mathbb{E}_{q8} or \mathbb{E}_{q9} does not provide any additional degenerated cases. Indeed, in all that cases the number of \Box on either side of the equations is non zero, and so neither side can be reduced to Id by iterating the rule.


Point in Lemma 2	Type of equation (Table 1)	Degenerated specialization
1	$\mathbb{E}q_0$	$k_0 = 0$
2	$\mathbb{E}q_1$	$k_0 = 0$ or $k_1 = 0$
3	$\mathbb{E}q_2$	$k_0 = 0$
4	$\mathbb{E}q_3$	$k_0 = 0$
5	$\mathbb{E}q_4$	$k_0 = 0$ or $k_1 = 0$
6	$\mathbb{E}q_5$	$k_0 = 0$
7	$\mathbb{E}q_6$	$k_0 = 0$.

Table 2: Degenerated cases of Table 1

3.3 Equivalent sets of equations

We now observe that some sets of equations are redundant, which reduces the number of cases to consider. We say that $\mathbb{E}q_i$ induces $\mathbb{E}q_j$, $i, j \in [0, 9]$, if for any $eq' \in \mathbb{E}q_j$, there exists $eq \in \mathbb{E}q_i$ which is equivalent to eq' . If $\mathbb{E}q_i$ induces $\mathbb{E}q_j$ and $\mathbb{E}q_j$ induces $\mathbb{E}q_i$, we say that $\mathbb{E}q_i$ and $\mathbb{E}q_j$ are exchangeable.

Left or right multiplication by the idempotent \diamond induces relations of exchangeability. For instance, left multiplying by \diamond any (non degenerated) equation $(\diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_1} \diamond$ in $\mathbb{E}q_1$ gives $\diamond(\diamond \square)^{k_0} = \diamond(\diamond \square)^{k_1} \diamond$ and equivalently $\square(\diamond \square)^{k_0-1} = \square(\diamond \square)^{k_1-1} \diamond$ which is an equation of $\mathbb{E}q_8$. Conversely, left multiplying by \diamond any equation of $\mathbb{E}q_8$ gives an equation of $\mathbb{E}q_1$. Hence, the set $\mathbb{E}q_1$ and $\mathbb{E}q_8$ are exchangeable. Other relations of exchangeability are computed in the same way. These relations are summarized in the following graph, which shows 4 strongly connected components, illustrating equivalence by exchangeability.



An edge of the form $\mathbb{E}q_i \xrightarrow{\diamond-} \mathbb{E}q_j$ (resp. $\mathbb{E}q_i \xrightarrow{-\diamond} \mathbb{E}q_j$) means that for any equation $u' = v'$ in $\mathbb{E}q_j$, the equation $\diamond u' = \diamond v'$ (resp. $u' \diamond = v' \diamond$) is equivalent to an equation of $\mathbb{E}q_i$. In other words $\mathbb{E}q_i$ induces $\mathbb{E}q_j$. Every edge being two-way, all the sets of a same component are pairwise exchangeable. As a consequence, we restrict our study to the $\mathbb{E}q_0$, $\mathbb{E}q_1$, $\mathbb{E}q_2$ and $\mathbb{E}q_3$ sets only.

3.4 A simple parameterization

The sets $\mathbb{E}q_0$, $\mathbb{E}q_1$, $\mathbb{E}q_2$, $\mathbb{E}q_3$ are described by equations with two integer parameters k_0 and k_1 . For $\mathbb{E}q_1$, $\mathbb{E}q_2$ and $\mathbb{E}q_3$, we show that only one integer parameter and one boolean parameter are needed to describe the equations. To do this, we define four subsets ; each is partitionned into two

parts corresponding to the boolean parameter. We take this opportunity to present most of the equations in a slightly different form, and to index our sets using a binary notation that will be useful later on. Note that the sets \mathbb{E}_{00} and \mathbb{E}_{q_0} are identical, the notation \mathbb{E}_{00} being introduced for the sake of homogeneity with \mathbb{E}_i , $i \in \{01, 10, 11\}$. In the following, we denote by $\underline{i} = 2i_1 + i_0$ the decimal notation for $i = i_1i_0$. Let us also define $\mathbb{E} = \bigcup_{i \in \{00, 01, 10, 11\}} \mathbb{E}_i$.

Definition 1. Let $\mathbb{E}_{00} = \mathbb{E}_{00}^\circ \cup \mathbb{E}_{00}^\bullet$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{00}^\circ &= \{(\diamond \square)^k = (\diamond \square)^{k+\ell} \mid k, \ell > 0, \ell \text{ even}\} \\ \mathbb{E}_{00}^\bullet &= \{(\diamond \square)^k = (\diamond \square)^{k+\ell} \mid k, \ell > 0, \ell \text{ odd}\} \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2. Let $\mathbb{E}_i = \mathbb{E}_i^\circ \cup \mathbb{E}_i^\bullet$, $i \in \{01, 10, 11\}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{01}^\circ &= \{(\diamond \square)^k = (\diamond \square)^{k+1} \diamond \mid k > 0\} \\ \mathbb{E}_{01}^\bullet &= \{(\diamond \square)^k = (\diamond \square)^k \diamond \mid k > 0\} \\ \mathbb{E}_{10}^\circ &= \{(\diamond \square)^k = (\square \diamond)^k \square \mid k > 0\} \\ \mathbb{E}_{10}^\bullet &= \{(\diamond \square)^k = (\square \diamond)^{k-1} \square \mid k > 0\} \\ \mathbb{E}_{11}^\circ &= \{(\diamond \square)^k = (\square \diamond)^k \mid k > 0\} \\ \mathbb{E}_{11}^\bullet &= \{(\diamond \square)^k = (\square \diamond)^{k+1} \mid k > 0\} \end{aligned}$$

Hereafter, we denote $\text{eq}_i(k_0, k_1)$ the equation of $\mathbb{E}_{\underline{i}}$ parameterized by k_0 and k_1 , with $i \in \{01, 10, 11\}$, and $\text{eq}_{00}(k, \ell)$ the equation $(\diamond \square)^k = (\diamond \square)^{k+\ell}$ of \mathbb{E}_{00} . We also denote by $\text{eq}_i^s(k)$ the equation of \mathbb{E}_i^s (resp. \mathbb{E}_i , if $s = \varepsilon$), $i \in \{01, 10, 11\}$, $s \in \{\circ, \bullet, \varepsilon\}$, of parameter k .

Lemma 3. For each $i \in \{01, 10, 11\}$, we have $\text{eq}_i^\bullet(k) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_{00}(k, 1)$.

Proof. For $i = 01$, we obtain the result, by right multiplying $\text{eq}_{01}^\bullet(k)$ by \square .

For $i = 10$, , we obtain the result by left multiplying $\text{eq}_{10}^\bullet(k)$ by $\diamond \square \diamond$.

By left and right multiplying by \diamond , the equality $\text{eq}_{11}^\bullet(k) : (\diamond \square)^k = (\square \diamond)^{k+1}$ is equivalent to

$$(\square \diamond)^k = (\diamond \square)^{k+1}. \quad (1)$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} (\square \diamond)^k &= (\diamond \square)^k \diamond \square && \text{from (1)} \\ &= (\square \diamond)^{k+1} \diamond \square = (\square \diamond)^k \square = \square (\diamond \square)^k && \text{from eq}_{11}^\bullet(k) \\ &= \square (\square \diamond)^{k+1} = (\square \diamond)^{k+1} && \text{from eq}_{11}^\bullet(k). \end{aligned}$$

Left and right multiplying by \diamond the equation $(\square \diamond)^k = (\square \diamond)^{k+1}$ we obtain $(\diamond \square)^k = (\diamond \square)^{k+1}$. \square

Lemma 4. For each $i \in \{01, 10, 11\}$, we have $\text{eq}_i^\circ(k) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_{00}(k, 2)$.

Proof. From $\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k)$, we obtain the result by right multiplying by \square .

From $\text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k)$, we obtain the result by left multiplying by $\diamond \square \diamond$.

From $\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k)$, we obtain the result by multiplying on the left by $\diamond \square \diamond$ and on the right by \square . \square

Lemma 5. For each $i \in \{01, 10, 11\}$, we have $\text{eq}_i(k_0, k_1) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_0)$.

Proof. Case $i = 01$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\diamond \square)^{k_0} &= (\diamond \square)^{k_1} \diamond & (1) \\
\Rightarrow (\diamond \square)^{k_0} \diamond \square \diamond &= (\diamond \square)^{k_1} \diamond \diamond \square \diamond \\
\Rightarrow (\diamond \square)^{k_0+1} \diamond &= (\diamond \square)^{k_1} \diamond & (2) \\
\Rightarrow (\diamond \square)^{k_0} &= (\diamond \square)^{k_0+1} \diamond & \text{from (1) and (2)}
\end{aligned}$$

Case $i = 10$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\diamond \square)^{k_0} &= \square (\diamond \square)^{k_1} & (1) \\
\Rightarrow (\diamond \square)^{k_0} \square \diamond \square &= \square (\diamond \square)^{k_1} \square \diamond \square \\
\Rightarrow (\diamond \square)^{k_0+1} &= \square \diamond \square (\diamond \square)^{k_1} \\
\Rightarrow (\diamond \square)^{k_0+1} &= \square \diamond (\diamond \square)^{k_0} & \text{from (1)} \\
\Rightarrow \diamond (\diamond \square)^{k_0+1} &= \diamond \square \diamond (\diamond \square)^{k_0} \\
\Rightarrow (\square \diamond)^{k_0} \square &= (\diamond \square)^{k_0}
\end{aligned}$$

Case $i = 11$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\diamond \square)^{k_0} &= \square (\diamond \square)^{k_1} \diamond & (1) \\
\Rightarrow \diamond (\diamond \square)^{k_0} &= \diamond \square (\diamond \square)^{k_1} \diamond \\
\Rightarrow \diamond (\diamond \square)^{k_0} \square \diamond &= \diamond \square (\diamond \square)^{k_1} \diamond \square \diamond \\
\Rightarrow (\square \diamond)^{k_0} &= \diamond \square (\diamond \square)^{k_1} \diamond \square \diamond \\
\Rightarrow (\square \diamond)^{k_0} &= \diamond \square \diamond \square (\diamond \square)^{k_1} \diamond \\
\Rightarrow (\square \diamond)^{k_0} &= \diamond \square \diamond (\diamond \square)^{k_0} & \text{from (1)} \\
\Rightarrow (\square \diamond)^{k_0} &= (\diamond \square)^{k_0}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 1. For each $i \in \{01, 10, 11\}$, the sets $\mathbb{E}q_{\underline{i}}$ and \mathbb{E}_i are exchangeable.

Proof. We have $\mathbb{E}_i \subset \mathbb{E}q_{\underline{i}}$. So $\mathbb{E}q_{\underline{i}}$ trivially induces \mathbb{E}_i . Let us show the counterpart :

- If $i = 01$ then we consider equation $eq_{01}(k_0, k_1)$: $(\diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_1} \diamond$. We can assume $k_0 \leq k_1$ since, by right multiplying by \diamond , we obtain the equivalent equation $eq_{01}(k_1, k_0)$.

There are two cases, depending on the parity of $k_1 - k_0$.

1. If $k_1 = k_0 + 2r + 1$ ($r \in \mathbb{N}$): From Lemma 5, we immediately deduce equation $eq_{01}^{\circ}(k_0)$. Conversely, from $eq_{01}^{\circ}(k_0)$: $(\diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0+1} \diamond$, we deduce $eq_{00}(k_0, 2)$: $(\diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0+2}$ From Lemma 4. We obtain $eq_{00}(k_0, 2r)$: $(\diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0+2r}$ iterating r times $eq_{00}(k_0, 2)$. Last, combining $eq_{01}^{\circ}(k_0)$ and $eq_{00}(k_0, 2r)$, we obtain $eq_{01}(k_0, k_1)$: $(\diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_1} \diamond$.
2. If $k_1 = k_0 + 2r$ ($r \in \mathbb{N}$): once again, by Lemma 5, we obtain equation $eq_{01}^{\circ}(k_0)$, then we deduce $eq_{00}(k_0, 2)$ from Lemma 4. We still obtain $eq_{00}(k_0, 2r)$ iterating r times $eq_{00}(k_0, 2)$. By combining $eq_{01}(k_0, k_1)$ and $eq_{00}(k_0, 2r)$, we obtain $eq_{01}^{\bullet}(k_0)$: $(\diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0} \diamond$.
Conversely, from $eq_{01}^{\bullet}(k_0)$, we deduce $eq_{00}(k_0, 1)$: $(\diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0+1}$ by Lemma 3. Iterating $2r$ times $eq_{00}(k_0, 1)$, we obtain $eq_{00}(k_0, 2r)$, which we combine with $eq_{01}^{\bullet}(k_0)$ to find again $eq_{01}(k_0, k_1)$.

- If $i = 10$ then we consider equation $\text{eq}_{10}(k_0, k_1)$: $(\diamond\Box)^{k_0} = (\Box\diamond)^{k_1}\Box$. We can assume $k_0 \leq k_1 + 1$ since, by left multiplying by \diamond , we obtain the equivalent equation $\text{eq}_{10}(k_1 + 1, k_0 - 1)$ where $k_0 > k_1 + 1 \Rightarrow k_1 + 1 \leq (k_0 - 1) + 1$.

There are two cases depending on the parity of $k_1 - k_0$.

1. If $k_1 = k_0 + 2r + 1$ ($r \geq -1$): from Lemma 5, we deduce equation $\text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_0)$, then we obtain $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2)$ by Lemma 4. We deduce $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r + 2)$ by iterating $r + 1$ times $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2)$. By combining $\text{eq}_{10}(k_0, k_1)$ and $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r + 2)$, we obtain $\text{eq}_{10}^\bullet(k_0)$: $(\diamond\Box)^{k_0} = (\Box\diamond)^{k_0-1}\Box$. Indeed, $(\diamond\Box)^{k_0} = (\Box\diamond)^{k_0+2r+1}\Box = \Box(\diamond\Box)^{k_0+2r+1} = \Box(\diamond\Box)^{(k_0+2r+2)-1} = \Box(\diamond\Box)^{k_0-1} = (\Box\diamond)^{k_0-1}\Box$.

Conversely, from $\text{eq}_{10}^\bullet(k_0)$, we deduce $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 1)$: $(\diamond\Box)^{k_0} = (\diamond\Box)^{k_0+1}$ by Lemma 3. Iterating $2(r + 1)$ times $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 1)$, we obtain $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2(r + 1))$, which we combine with $\text{eq}_{10}^\bullet(k_0)$ to find again $\text{eq}_{10}(k_0, k_1)$.

2. If $k_1 = k_0 + 2r$ ($r \in \mathbb{N}$): by Lemma 5, we immediately deduce equation $\text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_0)$.

Conversely, from $\text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_0)$: $(\diamond\Box)^{k_0} = (\Box\diamond)^{k_0}\Box$, we deduce $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2)$ from Lemma 4. We obtain $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r)$: $(\diamond\Box)^{k_0} = (\diamond\Box)^{k_0+2r}$ iterating r times $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2)$. Last, combining $\text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_0)$ and $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r)$, we obtain $\text{eq}_{10}(k_0, k_1)$: $(\diamond\Box)^{k_0} = (\Box\diamond)^{k_1}\Box$.

- If $i = 11$ then we consider equation $\text{eq}_{11}(k_0, k_1)$: $(\diamond\Box)^{k_0} = (\Box\diamond)^{k_1}$. We can assume $k_0 \leq k_1$ since, by left and right multiplying by \diamond , we obtain the equivalent equation $\text{eq}_{11}(k_1, k_0)$.

There are two cases, depending on the parity of $k_1 - k_0$.

1. If $k_1 = k_0 + 2r + 1$ ($r \in \mathbb{N}$): from Lemma 5, we obtain equation $\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_0)$, then we deduce $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2)$ from Lemma 4. We obtain $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r)$ iterating r times $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2)$. Combining $\text{eq}_{11}(k_0, k_1)$ and $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r)$, we obtain $\text{eq}_{11}^\bullet(k_0)$: $(\diamond\Box)^{k_0} = (\Box\diamond)^{k_0+1}$. Indeed, $(\diamond\Box)^{k_0} = (\Box\diamond)^{k_0+2r+1} = \Box(\diamond\Box)^{k_0+2r}\diamond = \Box(\diamond\Box)^{k_0}\diamond = (\Box\diamond)^{k_0+1}$.

Conversely, from $\text{eq}_{11}^\bullet(k_0)$, we deduce $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 1)$: $(\diamond\Box)^{k_0} = (\diamond\Box)^{k_0+1}$ by Lemma 3. Iterating $2r$ times $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 1)$, we obtain $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r)$, which we combine with $\text{eq}_{11}^\bullet(k_0)$ to find again $\text{eq}_{11}(k_0, k_1)$. Indeed, $(\diamond\Box)^{k_0} = (\Box\diamond)^{k_0+1} = \Box(\diamond\Box)^{k_0}\diamond = \Box(\diamond\Box)^{k_0+2r}\diamond = (\Box\diamond)^{k_1}$.

2. If $k_1 = k_0 + 2r$ ($r \in \mathbb{N}$): from Lemma 5, we immediately obtain equation $\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_0)$.

Conversely, from $\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_0)$: $(\diamond\Box)^{k_0} = (\Box\diamond)^{k_0}$, we deduce $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2)$ by Lemma 4. We obtain $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r)$: $(\diamond\Box)^{k_0} = (\diamond\Box)^{k_0+2r}$ iterating r times $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2)$, then $\diamond(\diamond\Box)^{k_0}\diamond = \diamond(\diamond\Box)^{k_0+2r}\diamond$ and $(\Box\diamond)^{k_0} = (\Box\diamond)^{k_0+2r}$. Combining with $\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_0)$, we obtain $\text{eq}_{11}(k_0, k_1)$.

□

Proposition 1 allows us to restrict our study to the sets \mathbb{E}_i , $i \in \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$.

4 Reducing equations

The aim of this section is to obtain the lattice shown in Figure 1, which highlights the induction relations between the sets of equations. First, we notice that any conjunction of equations in a set \mathbb{E}_i^s ($i \in \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$, $s \in \{\circ, \bullet, \varepsilon\}$) is equivalent to a single equation in the same set. Hence we investigate the conjunctions of equations belonging to distinct sets.

4.1 Homogeneous systems

Lemma 6. *For every $k_0, k_1, \ell_0, \ell_1 > 0$, we have*

$$\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, \ell_0) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k_1, \ell_1) \Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_{00}(m, d)$$

with $m = \min(k_0, k_1)$ and $d = \gcd(\ell_0, \ell_1)$.

Proof. Without restriction, we assume that $k_0 \leq k_1$. Let $0 \leq r < \ell_0$ be the only integer such that $k_1 - k_0 + r \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell_0}$. Then, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k_1 - k_0 + r = k\ell_0$. Applying k times $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, \ell_0)$, we obtain

$$(\diamond \square)^{k_0 + \ell_1} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + k\ell_0 + \ell_1} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + k_1 - k_0 + r + \ell_1} = (\diamond \square)^{k_1 + r + \ell_1}.$$

Then, considering $\text{eq}_{00}(k_1, \ell_1)$, we obtain

$$(\diamond \square)^{k_0 + \ell_1} = (\diamond \square)^{k_1 + r + \ell_1} = (\diamond \square)^{k_1 + r} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + k_1 - k_0 + r} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + k\ell_0}.$$

Once again, applying k times $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, \ell_0)$, we obtain.

$$(\diamond \square)^{k_0 + \ell_1} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + k\ell_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0}. \quad (2)$$

Let us denote by α_0 and β_0 the coefficients of Bézout:

$$\alpha_0 r_0 + \alpha_1 r_1 = d.$$

We assume that $\alpha_0 > 0$ (resp. $\alpha_1 > 0$). Applying α_0 times $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, \ell_0)$ (resp. α_1 times equation (2)), we have

$$(\diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + \alpha_0 \ell_0} \left(\text{resp. } (\diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + \alpha_1 \ell_1} \right).$$

Then,

$$(\diamond \square)^{k_0 + \alpha_0 \ell_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + \alpha_0 \ell_0 + \alpha_1 \ell_1 - \alpha_1 \ell_1} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + d - \alpha_1 \ell_1} = (\diamond \square)^{d + k_0 - \alpha_1 \ell_1} \stackrel{\text{by } 2}{=} (\diamond \square)^{d + k_0}$$

$$\left(\text{resp. } (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + \alpha_1 \ell_1} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + \alpha_0 \ell_0 + \alpha_1 \ell_1 - \alpha_0 \ell_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + d - \alpha_0 \ell_0} = (\diamond \square)^{d + k_0 - \alpha_0 \ell_0} \stackrel{\text{by eq}_1(k_0, \ell_0)}{=} (\diamond \square)^{d + k_0} \right).$$

In other words, $(\diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + d}$. And this proves the result.

Conversely, if we assume that $k_0 \leq k_1$ and if we set $q_0 = \frac{\ell_0}{d}$ and $q_1 = \frac{\ell_1}{d}$, we obtain

$$(\diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + q_0 d} = (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + \ell_0}$$

and

$$(\diamond \square)^{k_1} = (\diamond \square)^{k_1 - k_0} (\diamond \square)^{k_0} = (\diamond \square)^{k_1 - k_0} (\diamond \square)^{k_0 + q_1 d} = (\diamond \square)^{k_1 + \ell_1}.$$

□

Proposition 2. *For any pair of equations eq, eq' of \mathbb{E}_{00} there exists an equation eq'' of \mathbb{E}_{00} which is equivalent to $\text{eq} \wedge \text{eq}'$. Moreover $\text{eq}'' \in \mathbb{E}_{00}^\circ$ if and only if $\text{eq} \in \mathbb{E}_{00}^\circ$ and $\text{eq}' \in \mathbb{E}_{00}^\circ$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that for the gcd of two numbers to be even, both numbers must be even. Thanks to Lemma 6, we conclude the proof. □

Proposition 3. For each $i \in \{01, 10, 11\}$, $s \in \{\circ, \bullet\}$ and $k_0, k_1 > 0$, we have

$$\text{eq}_i^s(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_i^s(k_1) \Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_i^s(\min(k_0, k_1)).$$

Proof. The implication

$$\text{eq}_i^s(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_i^s(k_1) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_i^s(\min(k_0, k_1))$$

is obvious.

Conversely, for $i = 01$ (resp. $i = 10$), if we set $m = \min(k_0, k_1)$, left (resp. right) multiplying by $\diamond \square$ gives

$$\text{eq}_i^s(m) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_i^s(m+1)$$

and, repeating the process, for any $k \geq m$,

$$\text{eq}_i^s(m) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_i^s(k).$$

When $i = 11$, the converse part is similarly obtained by observing :


$$\begin{aligned} (\diamond \square)^{m+1} &= \diamond(\square \diamond)^m \square \\ &= \diamond(\diamond \square)^m \square && \text{from eq}_{11}^\circ(m) \\ &= (\square \diamond)^{m-1} \square \\ &= \square(\square \diamond)^{m-1} \square \diamond \diamond \\ &= \square(\square \diamond)^m \diamond \\ &= \square(\diamond \square)^m \diamond && \text{from eq}_{11}^\circ(m) \\ &= (\square \diamond)^{m+1} \end{aligned}$$

In other words $\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(m)$ implies $\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(m+1)$ and an almost identical sequence of equivalences shows that $\text{eq}_{11}^\bullet(m)$ implies $\text{eq}_{11}^\bullet(m+1)$. \square

Therefore, we summarize the result of the section as follows: A conjunction of several equations belonging to the same set \mathbb{E}_i^s reduces to a single equation.

4.2 Heterogeneous systems

To deal with the case of equations belonging to distinct sets, we begin by observing the graph of implications obtained by direct application of the \square operation.



Unfortunately, the edges only represent inductions but not exchanges such as we observed for the \diamond operation. We therefore need to consider several cases through the lemmas that follow.

Lemma 7. For any $k_0, k_1 \geq 0$, we have

$$\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_1) \Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_{11}^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)).$$

Proof. We first assume $k_0 \leq k_1$. From $\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_0)$, by Lemma 4, we deduce $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2)$ which is equivalent to $(\square\Diamond)^{k_0} = (\square\Diamond)^{k_0+2}$ (\dagger) by left and right multiplying by \Diamond both sides of this last equation. As $k_1 \geq k_0$, iterating $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2)$, we also have $(\Diamond\square)^{k_0} = (\Diamond\square)^{k_1+\varepsilon}$ with $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}$ (\ddagger). Then $\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_1)$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Diamond\square)^{k_0} &= (\Diamond\square)^{k_1+1+\varepsilon} && \text{by } (\ddagger) \\
&= (\square\Diamond)^{k_1} \square (\Diamond\square)^{1+\varepsilon} \Diamond && \text{by } \text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_1) \\
&= \square (\Diamond\square)^{k_1} (\Diamond\square)^{1+\varepsilon} \Diamond \\
&= \square (\Diamond\square)^{k_0+1} \Diamond && \text{by } (\ddagger) \\
&= (\square\Diamond)^{k_0+2} \\
&= (\square\Diamond)^{k_0} && \text{by } (\dagger)
\end{aligned}$$

In other words,

$$\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_1) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_{11}^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)).$$

Conversely, we deduce $\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_0)$ by left multiplying by $\Diamond\square\Diamond$ both sides of $\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_0)$. Indeed

$$\begin{aligned}
\Diamond\square\Diamond(\Diamond\square)^{k_0} &= \Diamond\square\Diamond(\square\Diamond)^{k_0} \\
(\Diamond\square)^{k_0} &= (\Diamond\square)^{k_0+1}\Diamond
\end{aligned}$$

We recall that $\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_0)$ involves (\dagger) and $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2)$ and then $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0 + 1, 2)$ by right multiplying by $\Diamond\square$. Iterating $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0 + 1, 2)$, we obtain $(\Diamond\square)^{k_0+\varepsilon} = (\Diamond\square)^{k_1}$ with $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}$ (\S). Then $\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_0)$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Diamond\square)^{k_1} &= (\Diamond\square)^{k_0+\varepsilon} \\
&= (\Diamond\square)^{k_0+1+\varepsilon} \Diamond && \text{by } \text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_0) \\
&= (\square\Diamond)^{k_0} (\Diamond\square)^{1+\varepsilon} \Diamond && \text{by } \text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_0) \\
&= (\square\Diamond)^{k_0} \Diamond \square \Diamond (\square\Diamond)^\varepsilon \\
&= (\square\Diamond)^{k_0} (\square\Diamond)^\varepsilon \\
&= (\square\Diamond)^{k_0+2} (\square\Diamond)^\varepsilon && \text{by } (\dagger) \\
&= (\square\Diamond)^{2+\varepsilon} (\square\Diamond)^{k_0} && \text{by } \text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_0) \\
&= \square (\Diamond\square)^{k_0+\varepsilon} \\
&= (\square\Diamond)^{k_1} \square && \text{by } (\S)
\end{aligned}$$

In other words,

$$\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_0) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_1).$$

Suppose now that $k_0 > k_1$. From $\text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_1)$, by Lemma 4, we deduce $\text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 2)$ which is equivalent to $(\square\Diamond)^{k_1} = (\square\Diamond)^{k_1+2}$ (\dagger) by left and right multiplying by \Diamond both sides of this last equation. As $k_1 < k_0$, iterating $\text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 2)$, we also have $(\Diamond\square)^{k_1} = (\Diamond\square)^{k_0+\varepsilon}$ with $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}$ (\ddagger). Then $\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_1)$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Diamond\square)^{k_1} &= (\square\Diamond)^{k_1} \square && \text{by } (\text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_1)) \\
&= \square (\Diamond\square)^{k_0+\varepsilon} && \text{by } (\ddagger) \\
&= \square (\Diamond\square)^{k_0+\varepsilon+1} \Diamond && \text{by } (\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_0)) \\
&= \square (\Diamond\square)^{k_1+1} \Diamond && \text{by } (\ddagger) \\
&= (\square\Diamond)^{k_1} && \text{by } (\dagger)
\end{aligned}$$

In other words,

$$\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_1) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_1).$$

Conversely, right multiplying $\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_1)$ by \square , we obtain $\text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_1)$.

From $\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_1)$, we obtain $\text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 2)$ by Lemma 4. Since $k_0 > k_1$, $\text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 2)$ implies $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2)$ and $(\diamond\square)^{k_0} = (\diamond\square)^{k_1+\varepsilon}$ (§) for some $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}$. Then $\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_1)$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} (\diamond\square)^{k_0} &= (\diamond\square)^{k_1+2+\varepsilon} && \text{by } \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2) \text{ and } (§) \\ &= (\diamond\square)^{2+\varepsilon}(\diamond\square)^{k_1} \\ &= (\diamond\square)^{2+\varepsilon}(\square\diamond)^{k_1} && \text{by } \text{eq}_{11}(k_1) \\ &= (\diamond\square)^{1+k_1+\varepsilon}\diamond \\ &= (\diamond\square)^{1+k_0}\diamond && \text{by } (§) \end{aligned}$$

In other words,

$$\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_1) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_0).$$

□

Lemma 8. For every $k, r > 0$, $i \in \{01, 10\}$, we have

$$\text{eq}_{00}(k, 2) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\circ(k+r) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_i^\circ(k).$$

Proof. We have to consider the two following cases:

- If $r = 2\ell$ is even, then we obtain $\text{eq}_{00}(k, r)$ by applying ℓ times $\text{eq}_{00}(k, 2)$. Hence,

$$\text{eq}_i^\circ(k+r) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k, r) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_i^\circ(k).$$

- If $r = 2\ell + 1$ is odd, then we obtain $\text{eq}_{00}(k, r+1)$ by applying $\ell + 1$ times $\text{eq}_{00}(k, 2)$. Left (resp. right)-multiplying both members of the equation $\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k+r)$ (resp. $\text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k+r)$) by $\diamond\square$, we find $\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k+r+1)$ (resp. $\text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k+r+1)$). Finally,

$$\text{eq}_i^\circ(k+r+1) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k, r+1) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_i^\circ(k).$$

□

Lemma 9. For every $k_0, k_1, r > 0$, $i, j \in \{01, 10, 11\}$, with $i \neq j$, we have

$$\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_1) \Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_i^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) \quad (3)$$

$$\text{eq}_i^\circ(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_j^\circ(k_1) \Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_{i|j}^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) \quad (4)$$

where $i|j$ denotes the bitwise disjunction of i and j .

Proof. We first prove Equivalence (3), for $i = 01$ and $i = 10$.

- Assume that $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_1)$ occurs. If $\min(k_0, k_1) = k_1$, the result is obvious. Otherwise, we have

$$\text{eq}_i^\circ(k_1) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 2) \text{ (by Lemma 4)}$$

then

$$\text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 2) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2) \text{ (by Lemma 6)}$$

and finally

$$\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_1) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_0) \text{ (by Lemma 8)}$$

- Conversely, suppose that $\text{eq}_i^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1))$ occurs. If $\min(k_0, k_1) = k_0$, we have $\text{eq}_i^\circ(k_0) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2)$ by Lemma 4 then, by repeating r times $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2)$, we obtain $\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r)$. Furthermore, left (resp. right)-multiplying $k_1 - k_0$ times both members of the equation $\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_0)$ (resp. $\text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_0)$) by $\diamond\Box$, we obtain $\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_1)$ (resp. $\text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_1)$). Otherwise, we trivially obtain $\text{eq}_i^\circ(k_1)$. Moreover, Lemma 4 gives us $\text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 2)$ and, by left (resp. right)-multiplying $k_0 - k_1$ times both members of the equation $\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_1)$ (resp. $\text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_1)$) by $\diamond\Box$, we obtain $\text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_0)$ (resp. $\text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_0)$). Finally, we have $\text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 2) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_0) \Rightarrow \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_1)$ by Lemma 8.

We deduce Equivalence (3) for $i = 11$ because

$$\begin{aligned} \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r) \wedge \text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_1) &\Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r) \wedge \text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_1) \wedge \text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_1) && \text{(Lemma 7)} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_{01}^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) \wedge \text{eq}_{10}^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) && \text{(previous equiv.)} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_{11}^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) && \text{(Lemma 7)} \end{aligned}$$

Equivalence (4) for $i = 01$ and $j = 10$ is shown in Lemma 7. Finally, we obtain Equivalence (4) when $j = 11$ for $i = 01$ or $i = 10$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k_1) &\Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k_1) \wedge \text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k_1) && \text{(Lemma 7)} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_i^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) \wedge \text{eq}_{i'}^\circ(k_1) && \text{(Proposition 3)} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_{11}^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) && \text{(Lemma 7)} \end{aligned}$$

where $i' = 10$ if $i = 01$ and $i' = 01$ if $i = 10$. □

Lemma 10. *For every $i \in \{01, 10, 11\}$, we have*

$$\text{eq}_i^\bullet(k) \Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_i^\circ(k) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k, 1).$$

Proof. From $\text{eq}_i^\bullet(k)$, we deduce $\text{eq}_{00}(k, 1)$ by Lemma 3. The three cases are detailed below:

- If $i = 01$ then, by applying $\text{eq}_{00}(k, 1)$ to the right-hand side of $\text{eq}_i^\bullet(k)$, we immediately obtain $\text{eq}_i^\circ(k)$.
- If $i = 10$ then $\text{eq}_{10}^\bullet(k)$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} (\diamond\Box)^k &= (\Box\diamond)^{k-1}\Box \\ &= \diamond\diamond(\Box\diamond)^{k-1}\Box \\ &= \diamond(\diamond\Box)^k \\ &= \diamond(\diamond\Box)^{k+1} && \text{by eq}_{00}(k, 1) \\ &= \diamond\diamond(\Box\diamond)^k\Box \\ &= (\Box\diamond)^k\Box \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\text{eq}_{10}^\bullet(k) \Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k).$$

- If $i = 11$ then $\text{eq}_{11}^\bullet(k)$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} (\diamond\Box)^k &= (\Box\diamond)^{k+1} \\ &= \diamond\diamond(\Box\diamond)^{k+1} \\ &= \diamond(\diamond\Box)^{k+1}\diamond \\ &= \diamond(\diamond\Box)^k\diamond && \text{by eq}_{00}(k, 1) \\ &= \diamond\diamond(\Box\diamond)^k \\ &= (\Box\diamond)^k \Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\text{eq}_{11}^\bullet(k) \Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k).$$

□

Lemma 11. For every $k_0, k_1, r > 0$, $i, j \in \{01, 10, 11\}$, with $i \neq j$, we have

$$\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r + 1) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\bullet(k_1) \Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_i^\bullet(\min(k_0, k_1)) \quad (5)$$

$$\text{eq}_i^\bullet(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_j^\bullet(k_1) \Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_{i|j}^\bullet(\min(k_0, k_1)) \quad (6)$$

Proof. We obtain (5) by applying the following sequence of equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r + 1) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\bullet(k_1) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2(2r + 1)) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\bullet(k_1) && \text{(iterating eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r + 1)) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2(2r + 1)) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_1) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 1) && \text{(Lemma 10)} \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_i^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(\min(k_0, k_1), 1) && \text{(Lemmas 9 et 6)} \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_i^\bullet(\min(k_0, k_1)) && \text{(Lemma 10)} \end{aligned}$$

We obtain (6) by applying the following sequence of equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{eq}_i^\bullet(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_j^\bullet(k_1) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 1) \wedge \text{eq}_j^\circ(k_1) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 1) && \text{(Lemma 10)} \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_{i|j}^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(\min(k_0, k_1), 1) && \text{(Lemmas 9 and 6)} \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_{i|j}^\bullet(\min(k_0, k_1)) && \text{(Lemma 10)} \end{aligned}$$

□

We have considered all combinations of equations belonging to sets suffixed with either \circ or \bullet . What remains to be studied are combinations.

Lemma 12. For every $k_0, k_1, r > 0$, $i, j \in \{01, 10, 11\}$, with $i \neq j$, we have

$$\text{eq}_i^\bullet(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 2r) \Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_i^\bullet(\min(k_0, k_1)) \quad (7)$$

$$\text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r + 1) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_1) \Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_i^\bullet(\min(k_0, k_1)) \quad (8)$$

$$\text{eq}_i^\circ(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_j^\bullet(k_1) \Leftrightarrow \text{eq}_{i|j}^\bullet(\min(k_0, k_1)) \quad (9)$$

Proof. Let us first show equality (7).

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{eq}_i^\bullet(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 2r) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 1) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 2r) && \text{(Lemma 10)} \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_i^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 1) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 2r) && \text{(Lemma 9)} \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_i^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(\min(k_0, k_1), 1) && \text{(Lemma 6)} \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_i^\bullet(\min(k_0, k_1)) && \text{(Lemma 10)} \end{aligned}$$

For equality (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r + 1) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_1) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r + 1) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2(2r + 1)) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_1) && \text{(iterating eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r + 1)) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r + 1) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) && \text{(Lemma 9)} \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2r + 1) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(\min(k_0, k_1), 2) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) && \text{(Lemma 4)} \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_{00}(\min(k_0, k_1), 1) \wedge \text{eq}_i^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) && \text{(Lemma 6)} \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_i^\bullet(\min(k_0, k_1)) && \text{(Lemma 10)} \end{aligned}$$

And for equality (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_j^\bullet(k_1) \\
\Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_i^\circ(k_0) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k_0, 2) \wedge \text{eq}_j^\circ(k_1) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(k_1, 1) \quad (\text{Lemmas 4 et 10}) \\
\Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_{ij}^\circ(\min(k_0, k_1)) \wedge \text{eq}_{00}(\min(k_0, k_1), 1) \quad (\text{Lemmas 9 et 6}) \\
\Leftrightarrow & \text{eq}_{ij}^\bullet(\min(k_0, k_1)) \quad (\text{Lemma 10})
\end{aligned}$$

□

Actually, the set of classes \mathbb{E}_i^s , $i \in \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$, $s \in \{\circ, \bullet\}$ constitutes a Boolean algebra if we provide it with the following order relation: $E < F$ if and only if for every $f \in F$, there exists $e \in E$ such that $e \Rightarrow f$. The structure of this algebra can be modeled by the lattice of Figure 1.




Figure 1: Lattice of the \mathbb{E}_i^s classes

In this lattice, every pair of elements E, F has a lower bound, denoted $E \wedge F$. The above results show that every pair of equations belonging to $E \times F$ has an equivalent equation belonging to $E \wedge F$.

4.3 Theorem of reduction

To summarize the results of this section, any presentation of a strict 2-PIM monoid reduces to a presentation with only one additional equation.

Theorem 1. *Any strict 2-PIM has a presentation reduced to three equations (including $\diamond^2 = \text{Id}$ and $\square^2 = \square$).*

Proof. The result follows from Propositions 2, 3 and Lemmas 9, 11 and 12. □

We summarize in Table 3 the classes of strict 2-PIMs with their unique relation if it exists. All these cases are non-degenerate for positive k and r .

This theorem is not strictly speaking a classification result. It remains to be proved that the cases identified are indeed distinct.

Monoid	Additional relation
M_\emptyset	None
$M_{00}(k, r)$	$(\diamond\Box)^k = (\diamond\Box)^{k+r}$
$M_{01}^\circ(k)$	$(\diamond\Box)^k = (\diamond\Box)^{k+1}\diamond$
$M_{01}^\bullet(k)$	$(\diamond\Box)^k = (\diamond\Box)^k\diamond$
$M_{10}^\circ(k)$	$(\diamond\Box)^k = (\Box\diamond)^k\Box$
$M_{10}^\bullet(k)$	$(\diamond\Box)^k = (\Box\diamond)^{k-1}\Box$
$M_{11}^\circ(k)$	$(\diamond\Box)^k = (\Box\diamond)^k$
$M_{11}^\bullet(k)$	$(\diamond\Box)^k = (\Box\diamond)^{k+1}$

Table 3: Classes of strict 2-PIMs

5 Lattice structure on sets of strict 2-PIMs

We set, for all $i \in \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$ and $s \in \{\circ, \bullet, \varepsilon\}$

$$\mathbb{M}_i^s = \{\langle \Box, \diamond \mid \{\Box^2 = \Box, \diamond^2 = \varepsilon, \text{eq}\} \cup \mathbb{E} \mid \text{eq} \in \mathbb{E}_i^s, \mathbb{E} \subset \mathbb{E}_q\}$$

In other words, \mathbb{M}_i^s (resp. \mathbb{M}_i if $s = \varepsilon$) is the set of monoids for which there exists a presentation containing a \mathbb{E}_i^s (resp. \mathbb{E}_i) equation.

5.1 An inclusion diagram

The following lemma allows us to show the inclusions of the lattice of Figure 2, while Lemma 14 allows us to show that these inclusions are strict.

Lemma 13. *Let $i, j \in \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$ and $s, s' \in \{\circ, \bullet, \varepsilon\}$. If for any equation eq of \mathbb{E}_i^s there exists an equation eq' of $\mathbb{E}_j^{s'}$, such that $\text{eq} \Rightarrow \text{eq}'$ then $\mathbb{M}_i^s \subseteq \mathbb{M}_j^{s'}$.*

Proof. Let $M = \langle \Box, \diamond \mid \{\Box^2 = \Box, \diamond^2 = \varepsilon, \text{eq}\} \cup \mathbb{E} \rangle \in \mathbb{M}_i^s$ then

$$M = \langle \Box, \diamond \mid \{\Box^2 = \Box, \diamond^2 = \varepsilon, \text{eq}, \text{eq}'\} \cup \mathbb{E} \rangle = \langle \Box, \diamond \mid \{\Box^2 = \Box, \diamond^2 = \varepsilon, \text{eq}'\} \cup \mathbb{E} \cup \{\text{eq}\} \rangle \in \mathbb{M}_j^{s'}. \quad \square$$

Applying Lemma 13, to the lattice of Figure 1, we obtain the inclusion diagram of Figure 2.

Lemma 14. *We have*

$$\mathbb{M}_i^\bullet \neq \mathbb{M}_i^\circ \text{ for } i \in \{00, 01, 10, 11\} \quad (10)$$

$$\mathbb{M}_{11}^s \neq \mathbb{M}_{01}^s \text{ for } s \in \{\circ, \bullet\} \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbb{M}_{11}^s \neq \mathbb{M}_{10}^s \text{ for } s \in \{\circ, \bullet\} \quad (12)$$

$$\mathbb{M}_{00}^s \neq \mathbb{M}_{01}^s \text{ for } s \in \{\circ, \bullet\} \quad (13)$$

$$\mathbb{M}_{00}^s \neq \mathbb{M}_{10}^s \text{ for } s \in \{\circ, \bullet\} \quad (14)$$

Proof. To show (10), we need only exhibit a monoid of $\mathbb{M}_i^\circ \setminus \mathbb{M}_i^\bullet$ for $i \in \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$. To do this, consider the set of matrices 2×2 with integer coefficients, equipped with the matrix product.




Figure 2: Inclusion lattice of the \mathbb{M}_i^s sets

case $i = 00$ If we set

$$\diamond = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \square = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

We can check that $(\diamond\square)^k = \begin{pmatrix} (-1)^k & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. We therefore have a value for k , such that $(\diamond\square)^k = (\diamond\square)^{k+2\ell}$ but $(\diamond\square)^k \neq (\diamond\square)^{k+2\ell+1}$. The monoid under consideration therefore belongs to \mathbb{M}_{00}° and does not belong to $\mathbb{M}_{00}^{\bullet}$.

case $i = 01$ If we set

$$\diamond = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & y \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \square = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

We can check that $\diamond\square\diamond\square\diamond = \diamond\square \neq \diamond\square\diamond$. We therefore have a value for k (in this case 1), such that $(\diamond\square)^k = (\diamond\square)^{k+1}\diamond$ but $(\diamond\square)^k \neq (\diamond\square)^k\diamond$.

It is easy to check that

$$\forall \ell > 0, (\diamond\square)^{2\ell} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \neq (\diamond\square)^{2\ell}\diamond = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\forall \ell \geq 0, (\diamond\square)^{2\ell+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \neq (\diamond\square)^{2\ell+1}\diamond = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The monoid under consideration therefore belongs to \mathbb{M}_{01}° and does not belong to $\mathbb{M}_{01}^{\bullet}$.

case $i = 10$

$$\diamond = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \square = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have for any $k > 0$:

$$(\diamond\square)^k = (\square\diamond)^k\square = \begin{pmatrix} (-1)^k & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

which also proves that for any $k > 1$, $(\diamond\Box)^k \neq (\Box\diamond)^{k-1}\Box$ and thus $\mathbb{M}_{10}^\bullet \neq \mathbb{M}_{10}^\circ$.

case $i = 11$

$$\diamond = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \Box = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have for any $k > 0$:

$$(\diamond\Box)^k = (\Box\diamond)^k = \begin{pmatrix} (-1)^k & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

which also proves that for any $k > 1$, $(\diamond\Box)^k \neq (\Box\diamond)^{k-1}\Box$ and thus $\mathbb{M}_{11}^\bullet \neq \mathbb{M}_{11}^\circ$.

To show (14), we set

$$\diamond = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ y & -1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \Box = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For all $k > 0$, we have $(\diamond\Box)^k = (\diamond\Box)^{k+1} = (\diamond\Box)^{k+2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ y & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ while $(\Box\diamond)^k\Box = (\Box\diamond)^{k-1}\Box = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

With these matrices, we also have for all $k > 0$, $(\diamond\Box)^k = (\diamond\Box)^k\diamond = (\diamond\Box)^{k+1}\diamond$ while $(\Box\diamond)^k = (\Box\diamond)^{k+1} \neq (\Box\diamond)^k$ which proves (11).

To show (13), we set

$$\diamond = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ y & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \Box = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For all $k > 0$, we have $(\diamond\Box)^k = (\diamond\Box)^{k+1} = (\diamond\Box)^{k+2} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ while $(\diamond\Box)^k\diamond = (\diamond\Box)^{k+1}\diamond = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ y & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

To show (12), we set

$$\diamond = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ y & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \Box = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For all $k > 0$, we have $(\diamond\Box)^k = (\Box\diamond)^{k-1}\Box = (\Box\diamond)^k\Box = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ while $(\Box\diamond)^k = (\Box\diamond)^{k+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ y & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

□

5.2 Intersections of the sets \mathbb{M}_i

We now show what the intersections of the different sets of monoids correspond to.

Lemma 15.

$$\mathbb{M}_{11} = \mathbb{M}_{10} \cap \mathbb{M}_{01}.$$

Proof. Let us show this result by double inclusion. The result of Lemma 13 gives us one direction of inclusion which is $\mathbb{M}_{11} \subset \mathbb{M}_{01} \cap \mathbb{M}_{10}$. For the other direction, let's assume we have the following equations:

$$(\diamond \square)^{k_0} = \square (\diamond \square)^{k_0} \in \mathbb{E}_{10} \quad (15)$$

and

$$(\diamond \square)^{k_1} = (\diamond \square)^{k_1+1} \diamond \in \mathbb{E}_{01} \quad (16)$$

If $k_0 \leq k_1$, Equation (16) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\diamond \square)^{k_1} &= \diamond \square (\diamond \square)^{k_0} (\diamond \square)^{k_1-k_0} \diamond \\ &= \diamond (\diamond \square)^{k_0} (\diamond \square)^{k_1-k_0} \diamond \\ &= (\square \diamond)^{k_1} \end{aligned}$$

This gives the equation $(\diamond \square)^{k_1} = (\square \diamond)^{k_1}$.

Suppose now that $k_1 < k_0$. By left and right multiplying by \diamond , Equation (16) becomes

$$(\square \diamond)^{k_1} = (\square \diamond)^{k_1} \square$$

We can now rewrite Equation (15).

$$\begin{aligned} (\diamond \square)^{k_0} &= (\square \diamond)^{k_0-k_1} (\square \diamond)^{k_1} \square \\ &= (\square \diamond)^{k_0-k_1} (\square \diamond)^{k_1} \\ &= (\square \diamond)^{k_0} \end{aligned}$$

This gives the equation $(\diamond \square)^{k_1} = (\square \diamond)^{k_1}$. In both cases, we obtain an equation of \mathbb{E}_{11} . We use Lemma 13 to conclude the proof. \square

Lemma 16. *For every $i \in \{01, 10, 11\}$, we have $\mathbb{M}_i^\bullet = \mathbb{M}_i \cap \mathbb{M}_{00}^\bullet$.*

Proof. By Lemma 14, we have $\mathbb{M}_i^\bullet \subset \mathbb{M}_i$. By Lemmas 3 and 13 we can conclude that $\mathbb{M}_i^\bullet \subset \mathbb{M}_{00}^\bullet$. For the inverse inclusion, the case $M \in \mathbb{M}_i^\bullet \cap \mathbb{M}_{00}^\bullet$ is trivial. Let us consider the case where $M \in \mathbb{M}_i^\circ \cap \mathbb{M}_{00}^\bullet$. We then have that M is presented by an equation of \mathbb{E}_i° and an equation of \mathbb{E}_{00}^\bullet . We then conclude by Lemmas 10 and 13. \square

6 Size of strict 2-PIMs

To prove that our result gives a classification, we first need to count the elements of each monoid. Let us start with the case of monoids characterized by an equation $\text{eq}_{00}(k, k+r)$ ($(\diamond \square)^k = (\diamond \square)^{k+r}$). There are 4 possibilities for the minimal writing of an element:

- $(\diamond \square)^i$ for $i \in [0, k+r-1]$.
- $(\diamond \square)^i \diamond$ for $i \in [0, k+r-1]$.
- $(\square \diamond)^i$ for $i \in [1, k+r-1]$. Be careful not to count twice the empty word ($i = 0$) already counted in case 1.




Figure 3: Summary of the situation

- $(\diamond\Box)^i\Box$ for $i \in [0, k+r-2]$. Indeed, $(\diamond\Box)^{k+r-1}\Box = \diamond\Box(\diamond\Box)^{k+r-1}\Box = \diamond(\diamond\Box)^{k+r} = \diamond(\diamond\Box)^k = (\diamond\Box)^{k-1}\Box$.

This implies that the cardinality of the monoid is $2(k+r) + 2(k+r-1) = 2k + 2r - 2$ elements. For instance, we recover the case of the Kuratowski monoid, which is given by the equation $(\diamond\Box)^4 = (\diamond\Box)^2$ ($eq_{00}(2, 2)$). We find its cardinal $4 * 4 - 2 = 14$.

We can refine this enumeration, looking at the length of the smallest word $lw(e)$ representing element e and counting the number of elements e for a fixed $lw(e)$. This information is summarized in the Hilbert series

$$\mathcal{H}_M(t) = \sum_{e \in M} t^{lw(e)}.$$

For example, for $M_{00}(k, r)$ the Hilbert series is easily deduced from the enumeration above. We obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_{M_{00}(k,r)}(t) = 1 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2(k+r-1)} 2t^i \right) + t^{2(k+r-1)+1}.$$

For the Kuratowski monoid, we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_{M_{00}(2,2)}(t) = 1 + 2(t + t^2 + t^3 + t^4 + t^5 + t^6) + t^7.$$

This corresponds to the following graduation on the elements

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
ε	\diamond	$\diamond\Box$	$\diamond\Box\diamond$	$(\diamond\Box)^2$	$(\diamond\Box)^2\diamond$	$(\diamond\Box)^3$	$(\diamond\Box)^3\diamond$
	\Box	$\Box\diamond$	$\Box\diamond\Box$	$(\Box\diamond)^2$	$(\Box\diamond)^2\Box$	$(\Box\diamond)^3$	

It is possible to systematize the calculation. First, let us consider the simplest case of the monoid M_{\emptyset} . When a relation holds, it is the highest degree member that contains the element to be removed from the series. Applying inclusion-exclusion principle, we obtain the series

$$\mathcal{H}_{M_{\emptyset}}(t) = \frac{1}{1 - 2t + 2t^2 - 2t^3 + \dots} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2t}{1+t}} = \frac{1+t}{1-t} = 1 + 2t + 2t^2 + \dots \quad (17)$$

When a relation between the generators is added, we need to consider the equivalent one that has the smallest degree (the highest degree of the two words in the equation) and remove the

Hilbert series of the ideal generated by the larger of the two words. For instance in $M_{00}(k, r)$, the equation $(\diamond\Box)^k = (\diamond\Box)^{k+r}$ is not the smallest one, because by left multiplying by \diamond , we obtain $\Box(\diamond\Box)^{k-1} = \Box(\diamond\Box)^{k+r-1}$. So we remove from $\mathcal{H}_{M_{00}}(t)$ the Hilbert series of the ideal generated by $\Box(\diamond\Box)^{k+r-1}$. That is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{M_{00}(k,r)}(t) &= \mathcal{H}_{M_{00}}(t) - t^{2(k+r)-1}\mathcal{H}_{M_{00}}(t) = \frac{(1-t^{2(k+r)-1})(1+t)}{1-t} \\ &= (1+t+\dots+t^{2(k+r)-2})(1+t) = 1+2(t+\dots+t^{2(k+r-1)})+t^{2(k+r-1)+1},\end{aligned}$$

as expected.

Now we examine the remaining cases by applying the same method

- For $M_{01}^\circ(k)$, we consider the relation $(\Box\diamond)^k = (\Box\diamond)^k\Box$ obtained by conjugating $(\diamond\Box)^k = (\diamond\Box)^{k+1}\diamond$ by \diamond and obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_{M_{01}^\circ(k)}(t) = \frac{(1-t^{2k+1})(1+t)}{1-t} = 1+2(t+t^2+\dots+t^{2k})+t^{2k+1}.$$

This yields $\#M_{01}^\circ(k) = \mathcal{H}_{M_{01}^\circ(k)}(1) = 4k+2$.

- For $M_{01}^\bullet(k)$, we consider the relation $(\Box\diamond)^k = (\Box\diamond)^{k-1}\Box$ obtained by conjugating $(\diamond\Box)^k = (\diamond\Box)^k\diamond$ by \diamond and obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_{M_{01}^\bullet(k)}(t) = \frac{(1-t^{2k})(1+t)}{1-t} = 1+2(t+t^2+\dots+t^{2k-1})+t^{2k}.$$

This yields $\#M_{01}^\bullet(k) = \mathcal{H}_{M_{01}^\bullet(k)}(1) = 4k$.

- For $M_{10}^\circ(k)$, we consider the relation $(\Box\diamond)^k = (\Box\diamond)^k\Box$ and obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_{M_{10}^\circ(k)}(t) = \frac{(1-t^{2k+1})(1+t)}{1-t} = 1+2(t+t^2+\dots+t^{2k})+t^{2k+1}.$$

This yields $\#M_{10}^\circ(k) = \mathcal{H}_{M_{10}^\circ(k)}(1) = 4k+2$.

- For $M_{10}^\bullet(k)$, we consider the relation $(\Box\diamond)^k = (\Box\diamond)^{k-1}\Box$ and obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_{M_{10}^\bullet(k)}(t) = \frac{(1-t^{2k})(1+t)}{1-t} = 1+2(t+t^2+\dots+t^{2k-1})+t^{2k}.$$

This yields $\#M_{10}^\bullet(k) = \mathcal{H}_{M_{10}^\bullet(k)}(1) = 4k$.

- For $M_{11}^\circ(k)$, we consider the relation $(\Box\diamond)^k = (\diamond\Box)^k$ and obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_{M_{11}^\circ(k)}(t) = \frac{(1-t^{2k})(1+t)}{1-t} = 1+2(t+t^2+\dots+t^{2k-1})+t^{2k}.$$

This yields $\#M_{11}^\circ(k) = \mathcal{H}_{M_{11}^\circ(k)}(1) = 4k$.

- For $M_{11}^\bullet(k)$, we consider the relation $(\Box\diamond)^k\Box = (\diamond\Box)^k\diamond$ obtained by right multiplying $(\Box\diamond)^{k+1} = (\diamond\Box)^k$ by \diamond and obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_{M_{11}^\bullet(k)}(t) = \frac{(1-t^{2k+1})(1+t)}{1-t} = 1+2(t+t^2+\dots+t^{2k})+t^{2k+1}.$$

This yields $\#M_{11}^\bullet(k) = \mathcal{H}_{M_{11}^\bullet(k)}(1) = 4k+2$.

Monoid	Order
M_\emptyset	∞
$M_{00}(k, r)$	$2k + 2r - 2$
$M_{01}^\circ(k)$	$4k + 2$
$M_{01}^\bullet(k)$	$4k$
$M_{10}^\circ(k)$	$4k + 2$
$M_{10}^\bullet(k)$	$4k$
$M_{11}^\circ(k)$	$4k$
$M_{11}^\bullet(k)$	$4k + 2$

Table 4: Order of strict 2-PIMs

7 Classification of strict 2-PIMs

This section is dedicated to the classification of strict 2-PIMs. We will check that two monoids are defined by two distinct equations of \mathbb{E} if and only if they are non-isomorphic.

First of all, the results of the following lemma are a direct consequence of the enumeration calculations in the previous section. For two monoids M and N , we write $M \sim N$ if they are isomorphic.

Proposition 4. *1. For every $i \in \{01, 10, 11\}$, $s \in \{\bullet, \circ\}$ and every couple k, k' of positive integers, we have*

$$M_i^s(k) \sim M_i^s(k') \Leftrightarrow k = k'.$$

2. For every $i \in \{01, 10, 11\}$ and every couple k, k' of positive integers, we have

$$M_i^\bullet(k) \not\sim M_i^\circ(k').$$

3. For every $i, j \in \{01, 10\}$ and every couple k, k' of positive integers, we have

$$M_i^\bullet(k) \not\sim M_j^\circ(k').$$

4. For every $i \in \{01, 10\}$, $s \in \{\bullet, \circ\}$ and every couple k, k' of positive integers, we have

$$M_i^s(k) \not\sim M_{11}^s(k').$$

Proof. Item (1) comes from the fact that for the two monoids of $M_i^s(k)$ and $M_i^s(k')$ to have the same number of elements, it is necessary and sufficient that $k = k'$. Item (2) arises from the fact that the two monoids $M_i^\bullet(k)$ and $M_i^\circ(k')$ can never have the same number of elements. The same argument can be used to prove item (3) and (4). \square

In the following, we will show that a strict 2-PIM contains a unique involution.

Lemma 17. *Let $M = \langle \diamond, \square \mid \{\diamond^2 = \text{Id}, \square^2 = \square, \text{eq}\} \rangle$ be a strict 2-PIM. Then \diamond is the only involution (apart from Id) of M .*

Proof. Let us assume there is another involution \diamond' in M . Necessarily, we have $\diamond' = \square^{\alpha_1}(\diamond\square)^p\diamond^{\alpha_2}$ with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \{0, 1\}$, $p \in \mathbb{N}$. As $\diamond'^2 = \text{Id}$, we have

$$\diamond'\diamond' = \square^{\alpha_1}(\diamond\square)^p\diamond^{\alpha_2} \square^{\alpha_1}(\diamond\square)^p\diamond^{\alpha_2} = \begin{cases} (\diamond\square)^{2p} = \text{Id} & \text{if } \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0 \\ \square(\diamond\square)^{2p} = \text{Id} & \text{if } \alpha_1 = 1 \text{ and } \alpha_2 = 0 \\ (\diamond\square)^{2p-1}\diamond = \text{Id} & \text{if } \alpha_1 = 0, \alpha_2 = 1 \text{ and } p > 0 \\ \diamond^2 = \text{Id} & \text{if } \alpha_1 = 0, \alpha_2 = 1 \text{ and } p = 0 \\ (\square\diamond)^{2p+2} = \text{Id} & \text{if } \alpha_1 = 1 \text{ and } \alpha_2 = 1. \end{cases}$$

In each of the above cases, the generated monoid is degenerate and monogenic (see Lemma 2). This concludes the proof. \square

Proposition 5. *For every $k, r, k', r' \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, we have*

$$M_{00}(k, r) \sim M_{00}(k', r') \iff k = k' \wedge r = r'$$

Proof. Let $\phi : M_{00}(k, r) \rightarrow M_{00}(k', r')$ be an isomorphism. We define by \diamond_ϕ (resp. \square_ϕ) the image of \diamond (resp \square) by ϕ . From Lemma 17 we have $\diamond_\phi = \diamond$. From Section 6 we have $\#M_{00}(k, r) = k + r - 2$ and $\#M_{00}(k', r') = k' + r' - 2$. As $M_{00}(k, r) \sim M_{00}(k', r')$, we have $k + r = k' + r'$.

For some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \{0, 1\}$, $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\square_\phi = \square^{\alpha_1}(\diamond\square)^p\diamond^{\alpha_2}$. Four cases arise:

1. If $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$, then we have

$$\phi((\diamond\square)^{k'}) = (\diamond(\diamond\square)^p)^{k'} = \square(\diamond\square)^{(p-1)k'} = \square(\diamond\square)^{(p-1)(k'+r')} = \phi((\diamond\square)^{k'+r'})$$

2. If $\alpha_1 = 1$ and $\alpha_2 = 0$, then we have

$$\phi((\diamond\square)^{k'}) = (\diamond\square(\diamond\square)^p)^{k'} = (\diamond\square)^{k'(p+1)} = (\diamond\square)^{(k'+r')(p+1)} = \phi((\diamond\square)^{k'+r'})$$

3. If $\alpha_1 = 0$ and $\alpha_2 = 1$, then we have

$$\phi((\diamond\square)^{k'}) = (\diamond(\diamond\square)^p\diamond)^{k'} = (\square\diamond)^{pk'} = (\square\diamond)^{p(k'+r')} = \phi((\diamond\square)^{k'+r'})$$

4. If $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 1$, then we have

$$\phi((\diamond\square)^{k'}) = ((\diamond\square)^{p+1}\diamond)^{k'} = (\diamond\square)^{k'p+1}\diamond = (\diamond\square)^{(k'+r')p+1}\diamond = \phi((\diamond\square)^{k'+r'})$$

Hence, for each case, $M_{00}(k, r)$ satisfies the equation $(\diamond\square)^{k'} = (\diamond\square)^{k'+r'}$. Thus, as $M_{00}(k, r)$ also satisfies the equation $\text{eq}_{00}(k, r)$, we have from Lemma 6 that $k \leq k'$ and r' is a multiple of r . As $k + r = k' + r'$ we have $k = k'$ et $r = r'$. \square

Let M be a strict 2-PIM and φ_M the canonical surjection from $\{\diamond, \square\}^*$ to M . Two words w and w' over $\{\diamond, \square\}^*$ are equivalent in M if $\varphi_M(w) = \varphi_M(w')$. A word $w \in \{\diamond, \square\}^*$ is quasi-reduced if it does not contain any factor $\diamond\diamond$ nor $\square\square$. If w is a word over $\{\diamond, \square\}^*$ then $[w]$ is the smallest equivalent word to w in M_\emptyset .

Lemma 18. *Let w and w' be two words over $\{\diamond, \square\}^*$ and $s \in \{\circ, \bullet\}$.*

1. *If w and w' are equivalent in $M_{00}(k, r)$ then $|[w]|_\diamond - |[w]|_\square \equiv |[w']|_\diamond - |[w']|_\square \pmod{2}$.*

2. If w and w' are equivalent in $M_{01}^s(k)$ then $[w] = \square u \Leftrightarrow [w'] = \square u'$.

3. If w and w' are equivalent in $M_{10}^s(k)$ then $[w] = u \square \Leftrightarrow [w'] = u' \square$.

Proof. For item 1, simply note that equation $eq_{00}(k, r)$ does not change the parity of $|[w]|_{\diamond} - |[w]|_{\square}$. As $[w]$ is quasi-reduced, the other two equations are not involved. For item 2 (resp. item 3), simply note that equation $eq_{01}^s(k)$ (resp. $eq_{10}^s(k)$) does not change the first (resp. last) letter of words $[w]$. \square

Proposition 6. For every $k, k', r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, every $i \in \{01, 10, 11\}$ and every $s \in \{\circ, \bullet\}$, we have

$$M_{00}(k, r) \not\sim M_i^s(k')$$

Proof. Since $eq_{11}^s(k) \Rightarrow eq_{10}^s(k) \wedge eq_{01}^s(k)$, it is sufficient to look only at the $i \in \{10, 01\}$ cases. Let us suppose that there exists an isomorphism $\phi : M_{00}(k, r) \rightarrow M_i^s(k')$. We define by \diamond_{ϕ} (resp. \square_{ϕ}) the image of \diamond (resp. \square) by ϕ . Let us suppose $\square_{\phi} = \square^{\alpha_1}(\diamond_{\phi})^p \diamond^{\alpha_2}$. Depending on the values of α_1, α_2, i, s and k' , we obtain an additional relation from the monoid M_i^s .

	$M_{01}^{\circ}(k')$	$M_{01}^{\bullet}(k')$
$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$	$\square(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'(p-1)} = \square(\diamond_{\phi})^{(k'+1)(p-1)} \diamond_{\phi}$	$\square(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'(p-1)} = \square(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'(p-1)} \diamond_{\phi}$
$\alpha_1 = 1$ and $\alpha_2 = 0$	$(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'(p+1)} = (\diamond_{\phi})^{(k'+1)(p+1)} \diamond_{\phi}$	$(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'(p+1)} = (\diamond_{\phi})^{k'(p+1)} \diamond_{\phi}$
$\alpha_1 = 0$ and $\alpha_2 = 1$	$(\square_{\phi})^{k'p} = (\square_{\phi})^{(k'+1)p-1} \square_{\phi}$	$(\square_{\phi})^{k'p} = (\square_{\phi})^{k'p-1} \square_{\phi}$
$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 1$	$(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'p+1} \diamond_{\phi} = (\diamond_{\phi})^{(k'+1)p+1}$	$(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'p+1} \diamond_{\phi} = (\diamond_{\phi})^{k'p+1}$

	$M_{10}^{\circ}(k')$	$M_{10}^{\bullet}(k')$
$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$	$\square(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'(p-1)} = (\diamond_{\phi})^{k'(p-1)+p}$	$\square(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'(p-1)} = (\diamond_{\phi})^{(k'-1)(p-1)+p}$
$\alpha_1 = 1$ and $\alpha_2 = 0$	$(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'(p+1)} = (\diamond_{\phi})^{(k'p+1)} \diamond_{\phi}$	$(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'(p+1)} = (\diamond_{\phi})^{(k'-1)(p+1)} \diamond_{\phi}$
$\alpha_1 = 0$ and $\alpha_2 = 1$	$(\square_{\phi})^{k'p} = (\diamond_{\phi})^{k'p-1} \diamond_{\phi}$	$(\square_{\phi})^{k'p} = (\diamond_{\phi})^{(k'-1)p-1} \diamond_{\phi}$
$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 1$	$(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'p+1} \diamond_{\phi} = (\diamond_{\phi})^{k'p+1}$	$(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'p+1} \diamond_{\phi} = (\diamond_{\phi})^{(k'-1)p+1}$

It can be seen that in all cases, the additional relation does not preserve parity between \diamond and \square and therefore contradicts Lemma 18. Then ϕ can not be an isomorphism which proves the result. \square

Lemma 19. Let k, k' be positive integers and $s, s' \in \{\bullet, \circ\}$. We have the two following assertions:

1. the monoid $M_{10}^{s'}(k')$ is not homomorphic to any digenic submonoid of $M_{01}^s(k)$,
2. the monoid $M_{01}^{s'}(k')$ is not homomorphic to any digenic submonoid of $M_{10}^s(k)$.

Proof. If ϕ is a morphism of monoids, we denote by X_{ϕ} the image of an element X by the morphism ϕ .

1. Suppose there is an morphism $\phi : M_{10}^{s'}(k') \rightarrow M_{01}^s(k)$. From Lemma 17 we have $\diamond_{\phi} = \diamond$. We have $\square_{\phi} = \square^{\alpha_1}(\diamond_{\phi})^p \diamond^{\alpha_2}$. The relation of $M_{10}^{s'}(k')$ is of the form

$$(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'} = \square(\diamond_{\phi})^{k'-\epsilon} (\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}).$$

This gives

$$(\diamond \square^{\alpha_1} (\diamond_{\phi})^p \diamond^{\alpha_2})^{k'} = \square^{\alpha_1} (\diamond_{\phi})^p \diamond^{\alpha_2} (\diamond (\square^{\alpha_1} (\diamond_{\phi})^p \diamond^{\alpha_2}))^{k'-\epsilon}.$$

If $\alpha_1 = 1$ then there exists a quasi-reduced word equivalent to the right hand side beginning with \square and there exists a quasi-reduced word equivalent to the left hand side beginning with \diamond . If $\alpha_1 = 0$ and $p > 0$ then we can apply a symmetric argument. In both cases, this contradicts point 2 of Lemma 18. If $\alpha_1 = 0$ and $p = 0$ then the image of the monoid by ϕ is not digenic.

2. Suppose there is a morphism $\phi : M_{01}^{s'}(k') \rightarrow M_{10}^s(k)$. From Lemma 17 we have $\diamond_\phi = \diamond$. Let $\square_\phi = \square^{\alpha_1}(\diamond\square)^p\diamond^{\alpha_2}$. The relation of $M_{01}^{s'}(k')$ is of the form

$$(\diamond\square)^{k'} = (\diamond\square)^{k'+\epsilon}\diamond(\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}).$$

This gives

$$(\diamond\square^{\alpha_1}(\diamond\square)^p\diamond^{\alpha_2})^{k'} = (\diamond\square^{\alpha_1}(\diamond\square)^p\diamond^{\alpha_2})^{k'+\epsilon}\diamond$$

If $\alpha_2 = 0$ and $p + \alpha_1 > 0$ then there exists a quasi-reduced word equivalent to the left hand side that ends in \square and there exists a quasi-reduced word equivalent to the right hand side that ends in \diamond . If $\alpha_2 = 1$ and $p + \alpha_1 > 0$ then we can apply a symmetric argument. In both cases, this contradicts point 3 of Lemma 18. If $\alpha_1 = 0$ and $p = 0$ then the image of the monoid by ϕ is not digenic. □

Proposition 7. *For every $k, k' \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, every $i \in \{01, 10\}$ and every $s, s' \in \{\circ, \bullet\}$, we have the following assertions:*

1. $M_{01}^s(k) \not\sim M_{10}^{s'}(k')$,
2. $M_i^s(k) \not\sim M_{11}^{s'}(k')$,

Proof. 1. This is a direct consequence of Lemma 19.

2. The case where $s = s'$ is solved in Proposition 4. Consider now $s = \circ$ and $s' = \bullet$. According to Lemma 7 and Lemma 10, we have $\text{eq}_{11}^\bullet(k') \Rightarrow \text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k') \Rightarrow \text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k')$ (resp. $\text{eq}_{11}^\bullet(k') \Rightarrow \text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k')$). This means that there exists a morphism $M_{01}^\circ(k') \rightarrow M_{11}^\bullet(k')$ (resp. $M_{10}^\circ(k') \rightarrow M_{11}^\bullet(k')$). We deduce that $M_{11}^\bullet(k')$ cannot be isomorphic to $M_{01}^\circ(k)$ (resp. $M_{10}^\circ(k)$) because otherwise the monoid $M_{10}^\circ(k)$ (resp. $M_{01}^\circ(k)$) would be homomorphic to $M_{01}^\circ(k')$ (resp. $M_{10}^\circ(k')$) which contradicts the item 1 of the proposition. Consider now $s = \bullet$ and $s' = \circ$. According to Lemma 7, we have $\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k') \Rightarrow \text{eq}_{10}^\circ(k')$ (resp. $\text{eq}_{11}^\circ(k') \Rightarrow \text{eq}_{01}^\circ(k')$). This means that there exists a morphism $M_{10}^\circ(k') \rightarrow M_{11}^\circ(k')$ (resp. $M_{01}^\circ(k') \rightarrow M_{11}^\circ(k')$). We deduce that $M_{11}^\circ(k')$ cannot be isomorphic to $M_{10}^\bullet(k)$ (resp. $M_{01}^\bullet(k)$) because otherwise the monoid $M_{10}^\bullet(k)$ (resp. $M_{01}^\bullet(k)$) would be homomorphic to $M_{01}^\circ(k')$ (resp. $M_{10}^\circ(k')$) which contradicts the item 1 of the proposition. □

Theorem 2. *For all couple of equations eq, eq' of \mathbb{E} , we have $\langle \square, \diamond \mid \{\square^2 = \square, \diamond^2 = \varepsilon, \text{eq}\} \rangle$ is isomorphic to $\langle \square, \diamond \mid \{\square^2 = \square, \diamond^2 = \varepsilon, \text{eq}'\} \rangle$ if and only if $\text{eq} = \text{eq}'$.*

Proof. According to Proposition 4, Proposition 5 and Proposition 7, we can conclude. □

8 Conclusion

We describe in Table 3 the classification of the different strict 2-PIMs depending on the form of the additional equation.

To complete the 2-PIM classification, we now need to look at the case where both generators are idempotent. Many examples of idempotent operations are closure operations (extensive and increasing idempotent). The notion of closure is defined at the level of sets and seems not to be encapsulated in the formalism we developed above. The reason we're particularly interested in these closure operators is that they are frequently used in language theory, particularly for calculating language orbits. In forthcoming works, we plan to embed the result in the study of several monoids like the ones that appears in [1, 4, 5, 6, 9].

References

- [1] Emilie Charlier, Michael Domaratzki, Tero Harju, and Jeffrey O. Shallit. Finite orbits of language operations. In Adrian-Horia Dediu, Shunsuke Inenaga, and Carlos Martín-Vide, editors, Language and Automata Theory and Applications - 5th International Conference, LATA 2011, Tarragona, Spain, May 26-31, 2011. Proceedings, volume 6638 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 204–215. Springer, 2011.
- [2] Harold Scott MacDonald Coxeter. Discrete groups generated by reflections. Annals of Mathematics, 35(3):588–621, 1934.
- [3] Harold Scott MacDonald Coxeter. The complete enumeration of finite groups of the form $r_i^2 = (r_i r_j)^{k_{ij}} = 1$. Journal of the London Mathematical Society, s1-10(1):21–25, 1935.
- [4] Jürgen Dassow. On the orbit of closure-involution operations - the case of formal languages. Theor. Comput. Sci., 777:192–203, 2019.
- [5] Jürgen Dassow. Some remarks on the orbit of closure-involution operations on languages. Inf. Comput., 281:104811, 2021.
- [6] Jürgen Dassow. The orbit of closure-involution operations: the case of boolean functions. Beitr Algebra Geom, 63:321–334, 2022.
- [7] Barry Gardner and Marcel Jackson. The kuratowski closure-complement theorem. New Zealand Journal of Mathematics, 38:9–44, 2008.
- [8] Preston Clarence Hammer. Kuratowski's closure theorem. Nieuw Arch. Wisk., 8(3):74–80, 1960.
- [9] Kazimierz Kuratowski. Sur l'opération \overline{A} de l'Analysis situs. Fundamenta Mathematicae, 3:182–199, 1922.
- [10] David Peleg. A generalized closure and complement phenomenon. Discret. Math., 50:285–293, 1984.
- [11] David Sherman. Variations on kuratowski's 14-set theorem. Am. Math. Mon., 117(2):113–123, 2010.